arXiv:1401.7000v2 [math.FA] 31 Mar 2014

Uniqueness of Eigenforms on Fractals-II

Roberto Peirone

Università di Roma-Tor Vergata,Dipartimento di Matematica
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133 Roma, Italy
E.mail: peirone@mat.uniroma2.it

Abstract. *I give an explicitly verifiable necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the eigenform on finitely ramified fractals, once an eigenform is known. This improves the results of my previous paper [14], where I gave some necessary and some sufficient conditions, and with a relatively mild additional requirement on the known eigenform. The result of this paper can be interpreted as a uniqueness result for self-similar energies on the fractal.*

MSC: 31C25, 28A80, Key Words: Dirichlet Forms, Fractals, Eigenforms

1. Introduction

This paper deals with analysis on finitely ramified self-similar fractals. In order to define a self-similar fractal, we start with finitely many contractive (i.e., having factor < 1) similarities $\psi_1, ..., \psi_k$ in $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ (more generally, in a complete metric space). Then, we can say that there exists a unique nonempty compact set K in $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ such that

$$K = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \psi_i(K), \tag{1.1}$$

which we will call fractal or self-similar set generated by this set of contractions. A tipical example of a self-similar fractal is the (Sierpinski) Gasket where we have three maps ψ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, which are the rotation-free contractions with factor $\frac{1}{2}$ that have as fixed points the three vertices P_i of a fixed equilateral triangle T, in formula $\psi_i(x) = P_i + \frac{1}{2}(x - P_i)$. Other examples are the Vicsek set, and the (Lindstrøm) Snowflake. The term finitely ramified means more or less that the "copies" $\psi_i(K)$ of the fractal intersect only at finitely many points. An example of an infinitely ramified fractal is the Sierpinski Carpet. In the present paper, I will consider a subclass including Gasket, Vicsek set and Snowflake, of the set of the P.C.F. self-similar sets, a class of finitely ramified fractals introduced by J. Kigami in [4]. In fact I require a mild additional hypothesis on the P.C.F.self-similar sets, as in other papers of mine, but also in other works (for example [16]). A description of the general theory of P.C.F. self-similar sets with many examples can be found in [5], or also in [16].

The problems discussed in this paper concern the construction of "energies" or in other words, Dirichlet forms, on fractals. This is a problem widely investigated in this area and can be also interpreted as the construction of diffusions, or of harmonic structures on the fractal. The self-similar Dirichlet forms, roughly speaking, are the "energies" $\mathcal{E}$ for functions defined on K with the property that

$$\mathcal{E}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i \mathcal{E}(v \circ \psi_i)$$

where the *weights* r_i are suitable positive numbers. On the P.C.F. self-similar sets such self-similar Dirichlet forms are in correspondence with the r-eigenforms, i.e., the eigenfunctions of a special nonlinear operator Λ_r defined on the set of the Dirichlet forms on the *finite subset* of the fractal $V^{(0)}$, which is a sort of boundary of the fractal, for example the three vertices of the triangle in the case of the Gasket. This correspondance is typical of finitely ramified fractals, and this makes the problems concerning self-similar energies on infinitely ramified fractals much harder. Such an operator Λ_r depends on the set r of weights $(r_i)_{i=1}^k$ placed on the "copies" $\psi_i(K)$ and is called the *renormalization operator*.

Natural problems in this context are the existence and the uniqueness (up to a multiplicative constant) of the eigenform. Such problems can be interpreted as the existence and the uniqueness of a diffusion. Results concerning the existence of an eigenform with fixed weights on finitely ramified fractals has been proved given in [6] , [15] and in [10]. In more recent papers, [2], [12], [13], conditions are given in order that there exists an r-eigenform corresponding to a suitable set of weights r. In particular, in [13] it is proved that this occurs on fractals with connected interior and on every fractal, but at a suitable level, that is on the structure $\mathcal{F}_n$ described in Section 4.

In this paper, I am interested in the uniqueness of the r-eigenform (up to a multiplicative constant) on finitely ramified fractals. On fractals which are not finitely ramified there is a recent uniqueness result on Carpet-like fractals in [1]. On many usual (P.C.F.) fractals, we have in fact the uniqueness of the r-eigenform. The first example of nonuniqueness was given by V. Metz in [7] where he proved that on the Vicsek set we have infinitely many normalized eigenforms. The uniqueness of the eigenform has been investigated for example in [8], [11], [15], where the uniqueness is proved on many specific fractals, but the results given in such papers appear to be hardly applicable in general situations. Usually the methods there apply when we have three vertices or when we require symmetry properties of the r-eigenform.

A more general uniqueness criteria is given in [9], where Theorem 15 provides a necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the r-eigenform, once we know an r-eigenform E, in terms of the derivative of the renormalization operator at E. Such a condition provides in many cases an explicit, although usually rather technical, method to verify whether a given r-eigenform is unique. However, such a condition does not appear to easily suggest a way to construct nontrivial cases of nonuniqueness.

In my previous paper [14], a method is described that allows us to prove some sufficient and some necessary conditions for the uniqueness and can be used in rather general situations, and in many cases allows us to deduce the uniqueness or nonuniqueness merely from the geometric structure of the fractal. In particular the nonuniqueness cases include fractals that are very far from being a tree. Moreover, an example was given where we have uniqueness or nonuniqueness of the eigenform, depending on the weights. The general necessary conditions and sufficient conditions were given under a relatively mild condition on the fractal denoted by (A), which is satisfied for example by fractals with connected interior.

However no explicit conditions given in [14] is both necessary and sufficient. In this paper, I improve the results of [14] and give an explicit (that is, effectively verifiable) necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of a given eigenform. At a first

step, I assume Condition (A), and a modification of a condition given in [14] turns out to be necessary and sufficient for the uniqueness of a given eigenform. Later, I remove condition (A), and give an explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the eigenform in the general case.

When (A) holds, thus the eigenforms are positive, the methods relies on the Perron-Frobenius Theory for the positive linear operator (denoted by $T_{j;E;r}$) that sends a function u on $V^{(0)}$ to the harmonic extension of u restricted to the cells containing the vertex P_j. Such an operator $T_{j;E;r}$ has a unique normalized positive eigenvector $\overline{u}_j$. The eigenform E is not unique if and only if the set of $\overline{u}_j$ has two disjoint nonempty subsets that have a special stability property. If we remove (A), we have preliminarly to split the complement of P_j into components, that we denote by $C_{j,1}, ..., C_{j,m_j}$, and we associate an eigenvector $\overline{u}_{j,s}$ to every component $C_{j,s}$, $\overline{u}_{j,s}$ being the eigenvector of a suitable power of $T_{j;E;r}$. In such a setting the nonuniqueness amounts to the existence of two nonempty disjoint subsets of the sets of all $\overline{u}_{j,s}$ that are stable in a sense similar to the previous. The proof in this general case is not a simple variation of the case where (A) holds, but requires some preparatory work. In particular, it is proved that the set positive coefficients of a given eigenform (which with (A) is the set of all coefficients) only depends on the fractal, thus is independent of the eigenform (Theorem 5.3).

2. Notation and Preliminary Results

In the present Section, I fix the general setting and give the preliminary results. First of all, I recall some notion on graphs. We say that a pair $(V, \mathcal{W})$ is a graph (or that $\mathcal{W}$ *is a graph on* V) if $\mathcal{W}$ is a set of subsets of V having two elements (the *edges* of the graph). We say that a finite sequence $(i_0, ..., i_n)$ in V is a path (or more precisely a $\mathcal{W}$-path) connecting i_0 and i_n if $\{i_{h-1}, i_h\} \in \mathcal{W}$ for every $h = 1, ..., n$. Given $V' \subseteq V$, we say that the path is *in* V' if $i_h \in V'$ for every $h = 1, ..., n-1$.

We say that $(V, \mathcal{W})$ is connected if any two points in V can be connected by a path. More generally, we say two points are connected in a subset V' of V if they are connected by a path in V'. We say that V' is connected if every two points in V' can be connected by a path in V'. When V' is not connected it can be split into its components. More precisely, if $x \in V'$ we call *component of* x *in* V' the set of $y \in V'$ such that x and y are connected by a path in V'. It can be easily verified that the components are connected and mutually disjoint and that V' is the union of the components in V'.

I now recall the basic definitions on fractals, following the same approach as in [14]. (a similar approach is discussed in [3] and in [11]). Namely, start with a finite set $\Psi = \{\psi_1, ..., \psi_k\}$ of one-to-one maps defined on a finite set $V^{(0)} = \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ (not necessarily a subset of $\mathbb{R}^\nu$), with $2 \le N \le k$, and put

$$V^{(1)} = \bigcup_{\psi \in \Psi} \psi(V^{(0)}) \,. \tag{2.1}$$

We call 1-cells the sets $V_i := \psi_i(V^{(0)})$ for $i = 1, ..., k$, and put

$$\mathcal{V} := \{i = 1, ..., k\}, \quad \mathcal{U} = \{1, ..., N\}, \quad J := \big\{\{j_1, j_2\} : j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{U}, j_1 \neq j_2\big\}.$$

On $\mathcal{V}$ we consider the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$ whose edges are $\{i_1, i_2\}$ such that $i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{V}$, $i_1 \neq i_2$, and $V_{i_1} \cap V_{i_2} \neq \emptyset$. We require that for each $j = 1, ..., N$

$$\psi_j(P_j) = P_j, \qquad P_j \notin \psi_i(V^{(0)}) \quad \forall\, i \neq j \;\forall\, j = 1, ..., N, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}} \text{ is connected.} \tag{2.3}$$

We say that $(V^{(0)}, V^{(1)}, \Psi)$ is a *fractal triple* and call it $\mathcal{F}$.

I will denote by $\mathcal{D}(V^{(0)})$ or simply $\mathcal{D}$ the set of the Dirichlet forms on $V^{(0)}$, invariant with respect to an additive constant, i.e., the set of the functionals E from $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$E(u) = \sum_{\{j_1, j_2\} \in J} c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)\big(u(P_{j_1}) - u(P_{j_2})\big)^2$$

where the *coefficients* $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E)$ (or simply $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}$) of E are required to be nonnegative. I will denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(V)$ or simply $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ the set of the irreducible Dirichlet forms, i.e., $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ if $E \in \mathcal{D}$ and moreover $E(u) = 0$ if and only if u is constant. This amounts to the fact that the graph $\mathcal{G}_0(E)$ is connected, where $\mathcal{G}_0(E)$ is the graph on $V^{(0)}$ formed by all $\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\}$ such that $c_{\{j_1, j_2\}}(E) > 0$. Every $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is uniquely determined by its coefficients. I will say that E is positive if all its coefficients are positive.

Recall that for every $r \in W :=]0, +\infty[^{\mathcal{V}}$ ($r_i := r(i)$) the *renormalization operator* is defined as follows: for every $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and every $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$,

$$\Lambda_r(E)(u) = \inf\Big\{S_{1;r}(E)(v), v \in \mathcal{L}(u)\Big\},$$

$$S_{1;r}(E)(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i E(v \circ \psi_i), \quad \mathcal{L}(u) := \big\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(1)}} : v = u \text{ on } V^{(0)}\big\}.$$

It is well known that $\Lambda_r(E) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and that the infimum is attained at a unique function $v := H_{1,E;r}(u)$. When $r \in W$, an element E of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is said to be an *r-eigenform* with *eigenvalue* $\rho > 0$ if $\Lambda_r(E) = \rho E$. As this amounts to $\Lambda_{\frac{r}{\rho}}(E) = E$, we could also require $\rho = 1$. It is well-known that if there exist two r-eigenforms on the same fractal, then they have the same eigenvalue. I will say that there is r-existence if there exists an r-eigenform, r-uniqueness if the r-eigenform is unique up to a multiplicative constant, and I will similarly use the expressions r-nonexistence and r-nonuniqueness. It is well-known that, *if E is an r-eigenform, then $r_i > \rho$ for every $i \in \mathcal{U}$ (not necessarily for every $i \in \mathcal{V}$).*

We say that $V^{(1)}$ is *A*-connected, or that (A) holds, if for every $j, j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, with $j_1 \neq j \neq j_2$, there exists a path connecting j_1 to j_2 in $\mathcal{V} \setminus \{j\}$. We say that $V^{(1)}$ is *O*-connected or with connected interior if

a) The 1-cells V_j, $j \in \mathcal{U}$ are mutually disjoint,

b) $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ is connected.

It is easy to verify that *O*-connected implies *A*-connected. Condition (A) is satisfied by many of the fractals discussed in literature. However, the tree-like Gasket, that is a fractal

like the Gasket but where two of the 1-cells are separated, does not satisfy it. The interest of such notions is that *if (A) holds, then every r-eigenform is positive.*

We define the linear operator $T_{i;E;r}$ from $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ into itself by $T_{i;E;r}(u) = H_{1,E;r}(u) \circ \psi_i$, for $i = 1, ..., k$ and more generally $T_{1_1,...,i_n;E;r} := T_{i_1;E;r} \circ \cdots \circ T_{i_n;E;r}$. We also define the standard operator L_E (here L stands for Laplacian) by

$$L_E(u)(P_j) = \sum_{h \neq j} c_{j,h}\big(u(P_h) - u(P_j)\big)$$

and we say that P_j is an E-harmonic point for u if $L_E(u)(P_j) = 0$ and that P_j is an E-nonharmonic point for u if $L_E(u)(P_j) \neq 0$. Now, I recall the main results in this context.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$. If u is nonconstant, then $L_E(u)$ is positive at some point and negative at some point. If, moreover, E is positive, then $L_E(u)$ is positive at the minimum points of u and is negative at the maximum points of u.*

Proof. As $\mathcal{G}_0(E)$ is connected and u is not constant, there exist $j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $c_{\{j_1,j_2\}}(E) > 0$ and $u(P_{j_1}) = \min u$, $u(P_{j_2}) > \min u$. By definition, we have $L_E(u)(P_{j_1}) \geq c_{j_1,j_2}\big(u(P_{j_2}) - u(P_{j_1})\big) > 0$. Similarly, if $c_{\{j_1,j_2\}}(E) > 0$ and $u(P_{j_1}) = \max u$, $u(P_{j_2}) < \max u$, then $L_E(u)(P_{j_1}) < 0$. If E is positive, we can apply the previous considerations to *any* minimum/maximum point of u, and the Lemma is proved. ∎

If $E, E' \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, let $\lambda_+(= \lambda_+(E, E')) = \max \frac{E'(u)}{E(u)}$, $\lambda_-(= \lambda_-(E, E')) = \min \frac{E'(u)}{E(u)}$, where the maximum and the minimum are taken over all nonconstant u. Also, let

$$A^{\pm}(= A^{\pm}(E, E')) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : E'(u) = \lambda_{\pm}(E, E')E(u)\},$$
$$\tilde{A}^{\pm}(= \tilde{A}^{\pm}(E, E')) = \{u \in A^{\pm} : u \text{ nonconstant}\}.$$

We say that X is a c-linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ if X is a linear subspace strictly containing the constants. We say that a set X is $T_{E;r}$-invariant if $u \in X$ implies $T_{i;E;r}(u) \in X$ for every $i \in \mathcal{V}$. We say that two c-linear subspaces X, X' of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ are almost disjoint if $X \cap X'$ is the set of the constants.

Proposition 2.2.

i) $A^{\pm}(E, E')$ are c-linear subspaces and $T_{E;r}$-invariant, for any E, E' r-eigenforms.

ii) E' is a multiple of $E \iff \tilde{A}^+ \cap \tilde{A}^- \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. i) is in [15], Lemma 5.13 and ii) is in [11], and is however trivial. ∎

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $\rho = 1$. If there exist an r-eigenform $\widetilde{E}$ and a nonempty subset H of $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, closed in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and invariant under Λ_r not containing any multiple of $\widetilde{E}$, then we have r-nonuniqueness.*

Proof. See [14], Lemma 2.7. This depends on Theorem 4.22 in [11]. ∎

Lemma 2.4 *Suppose $\widetilde{E}$ is an r-eigenform (not necessarily positive) with eigenvalue 1. Suppose X, X' are almost disjoint $T_{\widetilde{E};r}$-invariant c-linear subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$. Then the set*

$$K_{t,\widetilde{E},X,X'} := \left\{E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}} : E \le t\widetilde{E}, E \le \widetilde{E} \text{ on } X, E = t\widetilde{E} \text{ on } X'\right\}$$

is closed in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ *and* Λ_r *invariant for every* $t > 1$.

Proof. I outline the idea. For the details see [14], proof of Theorem 2.8. The set $K_t(:= K_{t,\widetilde{E},X,X'})$ is clearly closed. To prove that it is Λ_r invariant, we have to prove that for every $E \in K_t$, then $\Lambda_r(E) \in K_t$ as well, and the most delicate point is to prove that $\Lambda_r(E)(u) = t\widetilde{E}(u) \ \ \forall\, u \in X'$. In order to prove it, it suffices to prove that

$$H_{1,\widetilde{E};r}(u) = H_{1,E;r}(u) \quad \forall\, u \in X'. \tag{2.4}$$

Now, given $u \in X'$, note that $\Big(S_{1;r}(E) - tS_{1;r}(\widetilde{E})\Big)(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i(E - t\widetilde{E})\big(v \circ \psi_i\big)$ by definition of K_t is always non positive and attains the value 0 at $v = H_{1,\widetilde{E};r}(u)$ (as $H_{1,\widetilde{E};r}(u) \circ \psi_i = T_{i;\widetilde{E};r}(u) \in X'$). It follows that $H_{1,\widetilde{E};r}(u)$ is a stationary point for $S_{1;r}(E) - tS_{1;r}(\widetilde{E})$ on $\mathcal{L}(u)$, but, in view of a known result, it is also a stationary point for $S_{1;r}(\widetilde{E})$ on $\mathcal{L}(u)$. Consequently, $H_{1,\widetilde{E};r}(u)$ is a stationary point for $S_{1;r}(E)$ on $\mathcal{L}(u)$, thus, by the same result as above, it amounts to $H_{1,E;r}(u)$ and (2.4) is proved. ∎

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose there exists a positive r-eigenform* $\widetilde{E}$ *(this is true for every eigenform if (A) holds). Then there is r-nonuniqueness if and only if there exist two almost disjoint* $T_{\widetilde{E};r}$*-invariant c-linear subspaces of* $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$.

Proof. See [14], Theorem 2.8. ∎

Suppose E is a positive r-eigenform, so that, or every $j \in \mathcal{U}$ $T_{j;E;r}$ is a positive linear operator on $\mathbb{R}_j^{V^{(0)}} =: \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : u(P_j) = 0\right\}$. As a consequence, by the Perron-Frobenius theory (see Lemma 5.3 in [11]) there exists a (unique) positive eigenvector $\overline{u}_j(= \overline{u}_{j,E;r})$ of $T_{j;E;r}$ on $\mathbb{R}_j^{V^{(0)}}$ of norm 1 with positive eigenvalue $l_j(= l_{j,E;r})$, and for every $u \in \mathbb{R}_j^{V^{(0)}}$ there exists $\pi_j(u) = \pi_{j,E;r}(u)$ such that $\dfrac{T_{j;E;r}^n(u)}{l_j^n} \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \pi_j(u)\overline{u}_j$. Note that in [14], I used the notation $\overline{v}_j$ in place of $\overline{u}_j$, but I think that $\overline{u}_j$ is more coherent with the other notation in this context.

Lemma 2.6.

i) If E *is an r-eigenform, then* $L_E(u)(P_j) = \left(\frac{r_j}{\rho}\right)^n L_E\big(T_{j;E;r}^n(u)\big)(P_j)$ *for every* $P_j \in V^{(0)}$, *every* $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ *and every positive integer* n.

ii) If E *is a positive r-eigenform, then* $l_j = \rho r_j^{-1} \in]0, 1[$.

iii) If E *is a positive r-eigenform,* X *is a* $T_{E;r}$*-invariant c-linear subspaces of* $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, $u \in X$ *and* P_j *is an* E*-nonharmonic point for* u, *then* $\overline{u}_j \in X$.

Proof. See [14], Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. Note that i) is a standard result. ∎

3. Uniqueness and Nonuniquenes Results for (A) connected fractals.

In [14] there are some necessary and some sufficient conditions for the uniqueness of the eigenform. In this Section I will introduce a modification of one of the conditions which will turn out to be necessary and sufficient for the uniqueness of the eigenform.

If E is a positive r-eigenform, I say that *a subset B of $\mathcal{U}$ is (E,r)-1stable if, whenever $j \in B$, $j' \in \mathcal{U} \setminus B$ and $i \in \mathcal{V}$, then $P_{j'}$ is an E-harmonic point for $T_{i;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$.*

If E is an r-eigenform, *I say that a subset B of $\mathcal{U}$ is (E,r)-hstable if the set*

$$\mathcal{T}_{B,E} := \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : \textit{every point of } \mathcal{U} \setminus B \textit{ is } E\textit{-harmonic for } u\right\}$$

is $T_{E;r}$-invariant.

The results connecting such notions with the uniqueness of the eigenform are the following

(Lemma 4.4 in [14]) If E is a positive r-eigenform, and every two nonempty (E,r)-1stable sets are not disjoint, then there is r-uniqueness.

(Lemma 4.5 in [14]) If E is a positive r-eigenform and there exist two disjoint (E,r)-hstable subsets B and B' of $V^{(0)}$ having at least two elements, then there is r-nonuniqueness.

In [14], in fact, the term (E,r)-stable instead of (E,r)-1stable was used. I here prefer to reserve the name (E,r)-stable to the new notion I am introducing here, which will provide a necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness and to see the previous notion as the 1-case of it. Namely, if E is a positive r-eigenform,

I say that a subset B of $\mathcal{U}$ is (E,r)-stable if, for every $j \in B$, $j' \in \mathcal{U} \setminus B$, every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$, then $P_{j'}$ is an E-harmonic point for $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$.

At first glance, one could think that, in order to check whether a set is (E,r)-stable, we have to verify infinitely many conditions, but, in fact, we can reduce the problem to only finitely many conditions. In fact, given $B \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, let $X_{B,n}$ be the linear space generated by

$$\left\{T_{i_1,...,i_h;E;r}(\overline{u}_j) : i_1, ..., i_h = 1, ..., k, h \leq n, j \in B\right\}.$$

Then we clearly have $X_{B,n} \subseteq X_{B,n+1}$. Moreover, if the equality holds, then $X_{B,m} = X_{B,n}$ fo every $m \geq n$. In fact, $T_{i_1,...,i_{n+2};E;r}(\overline{u}_j) = T_{i_1;E;r}\left(T_{i_2,...,i_{n+2};E;r}(\overline{u}_j)\right)$ and as, by hypothesis $T_{i_2,...,i_{n+2};E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$ is a linear combination of elements in $X_{B,n}$, then $T_{i_1,...,i_{n+2};E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$ is a linear combination of elements of $T_{i_1;E;r}\left(X_n\right)$ thus is in $X_{B,n+1}$. Now, as $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ has dimension equal to N and $X_{B,0}$ has positive dimension, then there exists $n \leq N-1$ such that $X_{B,n} = X_{B,n+1}$, hence $\bigcup_{n=0}^{+\infty} X_{B,n} = X_{B,N-1}$.

It follows that a subset B of $\mathcal{U}$ is (E,r)-stable if and only if, for every $j \in B$, $j' \in \mathcal{U} \setminus B$, $n \leq N-1$, $i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$, then $P_{j'}$ is E-harmonic for $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$. In fact, by the argument above, if a point is E-harmonic for every function of the form $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$, $n \leq N-1$, then it is also E-harmonic for every function of the form $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we can verify with finitely many calculations what subsets of $\mathcal{U}$ are (E,r)-stable.

Theorem 3.1. *If E is a positive r-eigenform, then we have r-uniqueness if and only if every two nonempty (E,r)-stable sets are not disjoint.*

Proof. Suppose every two nonempty (E,r)-stable sets are not disjoint, and prove that there is r-uniqueness. By Theorem 2.5, we have to prove that, given two $T_{E;r}$-invariant

c-linear subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ X_1 and X_2 , then X_1 and X_2 are not almost disjoint. Let $B_h := \{j : \overline{u}_j \in X_h\}$ for $h = 1, 2$.

If $j \in B_h$, then $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E,r}(\overline{u}_j) \in X_h$ as X_h is $T_{E;r}$-invariant, thus, by Lemma 2.6 iii) B_1 and B_2 are nonempty and (E, r)-stable. Thus, there exists $j \in B_1 \cap B_2$, that is, $\overline{u}_j \in X_1 \cap X_2$, so that X_1 and X_2 are not almost disjoint.

For the converse, suppose there exist two nonempty disjoint (E, r)-stable subsets of U B_1 and B_2. Then for every $i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$ and $h \in B_i$, $j \in U \setminus B_i$, P_j is E-harmonic for $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_h)$. Now put

$$X_i := \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : P_j \,\text{is}\, E\text{-harmonic for}\, T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(u)\, \forall\, j \in U \setminus B_i, \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N},\, i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}\right\}.$$

Then, for every $i = 1, 2$ X_i contains $\overline{u}_h$ with $h \in B_i$, so that X_i is a c-linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$. Next, X_1 and X_2 are almost disjoint. In fact, if $u \in X_1 \cap X_2$, then every $j \in \mathcal{U}$ either lies in $\mathcal{U} \setminus B_1$ or in $\mathcal{U} \setminus B_2$, as B_1 and B_2 are supposed to be disjoint. Hence, by hypothesis, considering $n = 0$ in the definition of X_i, every $P_j \in V^{(0)}$ is E-harmonic for u, hence, by Lemma 2.1, u is constant. Finally, X_1 and X_2 are clearly $T_{E,r}$-invariant. By Theorem 2.5 we have r-nonuniqueness. ∎

Remark 3.2. We will now see that Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 in [14] can be seen as direct consequences of Theorem 3.1 here, hence all results in [14] can be deduced from it. Clearly, an (E, r)-stable set is (E, r)-1stable, and we are going to see that every (E, r)-hstable set B having at least two elements is (E, r)-stable. Let $j \in B$ and take $j_1 \in B$ with $j_1 \neq j$. Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ be a function that attains the value 1 at P_{j_1} and 0 at P_j and is E-harmonic at the other points. Thus, $u \in \mathcal{T}_{B,E}$. As P_j is E-nonharmonic for u by Lemma 2.1, and $\mathcal{T}_{B,E}$ is by definition, $T_{E,r}$-invariant, and is clearly a c-linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, by Lemma 2.6 iii) $\overline{u}_j \in \mathcal{T}_{B,E}$. Moreover, by the $T_{E,r}$-invariant again of $\mathcal{T}_{B,E}$, if $j' \in \mathcal{U} \setminus B$, then $P_{j'}$ is E-harmonic for $T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\overline{u}_j)$ for every $i_1, ...i_n \in \mathcal{V}$. In conclusion, B is (E, r)-stable, as required. ∎

4. Nonpositive eigenforms.

Given a fractal triple $\mathcal{F} := (V^{(0)}, V^{(1)}, \Psi)$, $\Psi = \{\psi_1, ..., \psi_k\}$, we can define a related fractal set $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ and a set $V^{(\infty)}$ that satisfy $V^{(0)} \subseteq V^{(\infty)} \subseteq K_{\mathcal{F}}$. Moreover, for any $i = 1, ..., k$ we can define a one-to-one map from $V^{(\infty)}$ into itself extending ψ_i, which we will still call ψ_i. As we will never use the set $K_{\mathcal{F}}$, I will not describe it. On the contrary, I will describe $V^{(\infty)}$ and the derived n-triples as they are essential for the following. However, I will merely recall the properties and will not give the details, which are standard (see, e.g. [13], Section 5). We put

$$\psi_{i_1,...,i_n} := \psi_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{i_n}, \quad A_{i_1,...,i_n} = \psi_{i_1,...,i_n}(A) \quad \forall\, A \subseteq K\,,$$

$$V^{(n)} := \bigcup_{i_1,i_2,...,i_n=1}^{k} V_{i_1,...,i_n}, \quad V^{(\infty)} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V^{(n)}\,.$$

The sets $V_{i_1,...,i_n} := V^{(0)}_{i_1,...,i_n}$ are called *n-cells*. Moreover, the sets are constructed in such a way that, if $(i_1,...,i_n) \neq (i'_1,...,i'_n)$, then

$$V^{(\infty)}_{i_1,...,i_n} \cap V^{(\infty)}_{i'_1,...,i'_n} = V_{i_1,...,i_n} \cap V_{i'_1,...,i'_n}\,. \qquad (\textit{nesting axiom})$$

As a consequence, if $(i_1,...,i_n) \neq (i'_1,...,i'_n)$ and $\psi_{(i_1,...,i_n)}(Q) = \psi_{(i'_1,...,i'_n)}(Q')$ with $Q, Q' \in K$, then $Q, Q' \in V^{(0)}$. Given the fractal triple $\mathcal{F}$, we also define a related n-fractal triple $\mathcal{F}^n$ by

$$\mathcal{F}^n := (V^{(0)}, V^{(n)}, \Psi^n), \quad \Psi^n := \big\{\psi_{i_1,...,i_n} : i_1,...,i_n \in \mathcal{V}\big\}.$$

Here, the map $\psi \in \Psi_n$ satisfying $\psi(P_j) = P_j$ is $\psi_{j^{(n)}}$ for every $j \in \mathcal{U}$. Here, for every $i \in \mathcal{V}$ $i^{(n)}$ denotes i repeated n times. Thus, we can define $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_n$, $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\mathcal{V} = \{j^{(n)} : j \in \mathcal{U}\}$ and $P^{(n)}_j = P_j$. Moreover, as $\mathcal{F}_n$ is a fractal triple, and consequently it satisfies (2.2), if $i_1,...,i_n \in \mathcal{V}$ and $j, h \in \mathcal{U}$, then we have $\psi_{i_1,...,i_n}(P_h) = P_j$ if and only if $i_1 = \cdots = i_n = j = h$. Let

$$W_n = \{r : \mathcal{V}^n \to]0, +\infty[\},$$

so that $r \in W_n$ can be written as $r = \big(r_{i_1,...,i_n}\big) : i_1,...,i_n \in \mathcal{V}$. In particular, if $r \in W$ we define $r^n \in W_n$ by $r^n_{i_1,...,i_n} = r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_n}$. If $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $r \in W_n$ we denote by $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\Lambda_r(E)$ the form $\Lambda_r(E)$ in the triple $\mathcal{F}_n$. This can be seen in the following way

$$\mathcal{F}_n\text{-}\Lambda_r(E)(u) = \inf\Big\{S_{n;r}(E)(v), v \in \mathcal{L}(n,u)\Big\}$$

$$S_{n;r}(E)(v) := \sum_{i_1,...,i_n=1}^{k} r_{i_1,...,i_n} E(v \circ \psi_{i_1,...,i_n}), \quad \mathcal{L}(n,u) := \big\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(n)}} : v = u \text{ on } V^{(0)}\big\}.$$

The infimum is attained at a unique function $v := H_{n,E;r}(u)$. When $r \in W$, we write $\Lambda_{r^n}(E)$ short for $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\Lambda_{r^n}(E)$ as we know that r^n lies in W_n. We will occasionally use the following generalization. Suppose V' is a nonempty subset of $V^{(n)}$, $r \in W_n$ and $w : V' \to \mathbb{R}$. Then, we will denote by $H_{V^{(n)},V'}\big(S_{n,r}(E)\big)(w)$ the unique function from $V^{(n)}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ that amounts to w on V' and minimizes $S_{n,r}(E)$. The following is well-known.

Lemma 4.1
i) $\Lambda_{r^n}(E) = \Lambda^n_r(E)$ *for every* $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ *and* $r \in W_1$.
ii) $\mathcal{F}_n$-$T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r^n}(u) = T_{i_n;E;r} \circ \cdots \circ T_{i_1;E;r}(u)$ *for every* $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, *if* $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ *is an r-eigenform.* ∎

Note that in view of Lemma 4.1 i), if E in an r-eigenform in $\mathcal{F}$, then E is an r^n-eigenform in $\mathcal{F}_n$, and such a fact will be used implicitly in Section 6, as we will always assume there that E is an r-eigenform, and in some points we will have to consider E in $\mathcal{F}_n$. We are now going to define some graphs useful for the rest of the paper. First, we define graphs only depending on $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_1$ be the graph on $V^{(1)}$ whose edges are the sets of the form

$$\big\{\psi_i(P_{j_1}),\psi_i(P_{j_2})\big\},\quad i\in\mathcal{V},\{j_1,j_2\}\in J,$$

and $\mathcal{G}_1'$ be the graph on $V^{(1)}$ whose edges are the sets of the form

$$\big\{\psi_i(P_{j_1}),\psi_i(P_{j_2})\big\},\quad i\in\mathcal{V}\setminus\mathcal{U},\{j_1,j_2\}\in J.$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be the graph on $V^{(0)}$ defined by the set of $\{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\}$ such that $\{j_1,j_2\}\in J$, and there exist $Q_1\in V_{j_1}$ and $Q_2\in V_{j_2}$ that are connected in the graph $\mathcal{G}_1'$. Next, given $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ we define some graphs related to E. Let $\mathcal{G}_n(E)$ be the graph on $V^{(n)}$ defined by

$$\big\{\{\psi_{i_1,\dots,i_n}(P_{j_1}),\psi_{i_1,\dots,i_n}(P_{j_2})\}:\{j_1,j_2\}\in J,c_{j_1,j_2}(E)>0\big\}.$$

Given a graph $\mathcal{G}$ on $V^{(0)}$, let $S(\mathcal{G})$ be the graph on $V^{(1)}$ defined by the set of $\big\{\psi_i(P_{j_1}),\psi_i(P_{j_2})\big\}$ such that $\{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\}\in\mathcal{G}$. Note that $S(\mathcal{G}_0(E))=\mathcal{G}_1(E)$. Let $\Lambda(\mathcal{G})$ be the graph on $V^{(0)}$ defined by the set of $\{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\}$ such that $\{j_1,j_2\}\in J$, and P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} are connected in $V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)}$ by a path in $S(\mathcal{G})$. We will write $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\Lambda(\mathcal{G})$, $\mathcal{F}_n$-$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and so on to denote that the graphs are defined in the triple $\mathcal{F}_n$. The statements of the following lemma are either well known or trivial.

Lemma 4.2
i) If $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ are graphs on $V^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{G}\subseteq\mathcal{G}'$, then $\Lambda(\mathcal{G})\subseteq\Lambda(\mathcal{G}')$.
ii) The graphs $\mathcal{G}_n(E)$, $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ are connected. Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected graph on $V^{(0)}$, so is also $\Lambda(\mathcal{G})$.
iii) $\Lambda\big(\mathcal{G}_0(E)\big)=\mathcal{G}_0\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big)$ for every $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $r\in W$.
iv) If E is an r-eigenform, then $\Lambda\big(\mathcal{G}_0(E)\big)=\mathcal{G}_0(E)$.
v) $\Lambda(\mathcal{G})\supseteq\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ for every connected graph $\mathcal{G}$ on $V^{(0)}$. ∎

It follows that $\Lambda^n(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ is increasing in n, hence there exists n_1 such that $\Lambda^n(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})=\Lambda^{n_1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ for every $n\geq n_1$. Put $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}=\Lambda^{n_1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})=\bigcup_{n=0}^{+\infty}\Lambda^n(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$. Note that clearly $\Lambda(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})=\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

Corollary 4.3 *If $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is an r-eigenform, then $\mathcal{G}_0(E)\supseteq\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{G}_0(E)\supseteq\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ by Lemma 4.2 v), and by recursion, in view of Lemma 4.2, i) and iv), $\mathcal{G}_0(E)\supseteq\Lambda^n(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})$ for every n, in particular for $n=n_1$. ∎

The following Lemma provides some standard variants of the well-known *maximum principle*, which corresponds to Lemma 4.4 i) in the case $C=\mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$.*
i) Suppose V' is a nonempty subset of $V^{(1)}$, $w:V'\to\mathbb{R}$, C is a nonempty connected subset of $\mathcal{V}$, let $v:=H_{V^{(1)},V'}(S_{1;r}(E))(w)$, and put $\partial=V'\cup\big(V(C)\cap V(\mathcal{V}\setminus C)\big)$. Then v attains its extrema (maximum and minimum) on $V(C)$ at points in $\partial\cap V(C)$.
ii) Given $Q\in V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)}$, $u\in\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, let $v=H_{1;E;r}(u)$ and let

$$R_E(Q) := \big\{P \in V^{(0)} : P \text{ and } Q \text{ are connected in } \big(V^{(1)} \setminus V^{(0)}, \mathcal{G}_1(E)\big)\big\}$$

Then $\min\limits_{R_E(Q)} u \le v(Q) \le \max\limits_{R_E(Q)} u$ *and the inequalities are strict unless* u *is constant on* $R_E(Q)$.

iii) If $u \ge 0$, *then* $T_{j;E;r}(u) \ge 0$.

Proof. (Hint). i) Suppose that for some $Q \in V(C) \setminus \partial$, $v(Q) := M$ is the maximum (resp. minimum) of v on $V(C)$. Then, $v(Q') = v(Q)$ if $\{Q', Q\} \in \mathcal{G}_1(E)$, and such a point Q' belongs to $V(C)$ by the definition of ∂. Hence, either i) for maximum (resp. minimum) holds or $v(Q') = M$ for every $Q' \in V(C)$. But, if $C = \mathcal{V}$, this implies $v(Q') = M$ for every $Q' \in V'$, if $C \subsetneq \mathcal{V}$, this implies $v(Q') = M$ for some $Q' \in V(C) \cap V(\mathcal{V} \setminus C)$, and i) for maximum (resp. minimum) holds again. ii) is well-known (e.g., it is in [11], Prop. 4.10) and can be proved like the maximum principle, and iii) is an immediate consequence of i) with $C = \mathcal{V}$ and $V' = V^{(0)}$. ∎

5. Graph of an r-eigenform.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $w : V' \to \mathbb{R}$, $V' := V^{(0)} \setminus \{P_{j_1}\}$ *be defined by* $w = \chi_{\{P_{j_2}\}}$. *Let* $v = H_{V^{(1)},V'}(S_{1;r}(E))(w)$. *Then* $v(P_{j_1}) = \dfrac{c_{j_1,j_2}(\Lambda_r(E))}{\sum\limits_{j \ne j_1} c_{j_1,j}\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big)}$.

Proof. As $v|_{V^{(0)}}$ minimizes $\Lambda_r(E)$ among the functions $v' : V^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $v' = w$ on V', then the value $x := v(P_{j_1})$ minimizes

$$\sum_{j \ne j_1} c_{j,j_1}\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big)\big(x - v(P_j)\big)^2 = c_{j_1,j_2}(\Lambda_r(E))(x-1)^2 + \sum_{j_1 \ne j \ne j_2} c_{j,j_1}\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big)x^2.$$

Thus taking the derivatives we have

$$x \sum_{j \ne j_1} c_{j,j_1}\big(\Lambda_r(E)\big) = c_{j_1,j_2}(\Lambda_r(E)). \quad ∎$$

Lemma 5.2. *If* $\{j_1, j_2\} \in J$ *and* $j_1^{(n)}$ *and* $j_2^{(n)}$ *are connected in* $V^{(n)} \setminus \big\{j^{(n)} : j \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}\big\}$ *in the graph* $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}_n}$, *then* $\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. Let $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ be so that $\mathcal{G}_0(\widetilde{E}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Then

$$\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\} \in \mathcal{F}_n\text{-}\widetilde{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n\text{-}\Lambda(\mathcal{G}_0) = \mathcal{G}\big(\Lambda_{r^n}(\widetilde{E})\big) = \mathcal{G}\big(\Lambda_r^n(\widetilde{E})\big) = \Lambda^n(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{G}}. \quad ∎$$

Theorem 5.3. *If* $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ *is an* r*-eigenform, then* $\mathcal{G}_0(E) = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. In view of Corollary 4.3 it suffices to prove the inclusion "$\subseteq$". Thus, it suffices to prove that given $\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\} \notin \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, then $c_{j_1,j_2}(E) = 0$. Let w_n and v_n be as in Lemma 5.1 where we take $\mathcal{F}_n$ in place of $\mathcal{F}$ and r^n in place of r. We are going to prove that

$$v_n(P_{j_1}) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{5.1}$$

As E is an r-eigenform, in view of Lemma 5.1 we have

$$v_n(P_{j_1}) = \frac{c_{j_1,j_2}(\Lambda_{r^n}(E))}{\sum\limits_{j\neq j_1} c_{j_1,j}\big(\Lambda_{r^n}(E)\big)} = \frac{c_{j_1,j_2}(\Lambda_r^n(E))}{\sum\limits_{j\neq j_1} c_{j_1,j}\big(\Lambda_r^n(E)\big)} = \frac{c_{j_1,j_2}(E)}{\sum\limits_{j\neq j_1} c_{j_1,j}(E)}$$

and by (5.1) we deduce $c_{j_1,j_2}(E) = 0$, as required. By the maximum principle we have $0 \leq v_n \leq 1$ on $V^{(1)}$. Let now $j \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}$. By Lemma 4.1 ii) we have

$$v_n \circ \psi_{j^{(n)}} = T^n_{j;E;r}(v_n|_{V^{(0)}}).$$

On the other hand, by the maximum principle and a compactness argument there exists $\overline{\alpha} \in]0,1[$ such that $\mathrm{Osc}(T_{j;E;r}(u)) \leq \overline{\alpha}\mathrm{Osc}(u)$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\overline{n}$ such that for every such j and $n \geq \overline{n}$ we have $\mathrm{Osc}(v_n \circ \psi_{j^{(n)}}) \leq \varepsilon$. As $v_n(P_j) = 0$ by definition, we then have

$$v_n \circ \psi_{j^{(n)}} \leq \varepsilon. \tag{5.2}$$

Let C be the component of $j_1^{(n)}$ in $\{(i_1, ..., i_n)\} \setminus \{j^{(n)} : j_1 \neq j \neq j_2\}$ and take $n \geq \overline{n}$. As $\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\} \notin \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, by Lemma 5.2 $j_2^{(n)} \notin C$, hence $V' \cap \partial = \emptyset$. By Lemma 4.4 i), v_n takes the maximum on $V(C)$ at points in ∂ that in our case is contained in $\bigcup\limits_{j_1\neq j\neq j_2} V_{j^{(n)}}$. Thus, by (5.2) we have $0 \leq v_n(Q) \leq \varepsilon$ for every $Q \in V(C)$, in particular for $Q = P_{j_1}$ and (5.1) is proved. ∎

6. Components of $V^{(0)} \setminus \{P_j\}$.

Given $j \in \mathcal{U}$, let $C_{j,1}, ..., C_{j,m_j}$ be the components of $V^{(0)} \setminus \{P_j\}$ in the graph $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, which, in view of Theorem 5.3 amounts to $\mathcal{G}_0(E) = \Lambda\big(\mathcal{G}_0(E)\big)$, whenever $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is an r-eigenform. In this Section we will suppose that E is an r-eigenform. We will not take care of determining what results are also valid for a generic $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$. When $j' \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{j\}$, let

$$L_j(P_{j'}) := \big\{P_h \in V^{(0)} \setminus \{P_j\} : P_{j'} \text{ is connected to } \psi_j(P_h) \text{ in } \big(V^{(1)} \setminus V^{(0)}, S(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})\big)\big\}.$$

More generally, we put $L_j(B) = \bigcup\limits_{P_{j'}\in B} L_j(P_{j'})$ when $B \subseteq V^{(0)} \setminus \{P_j\}$. In Lemma 6.1, we will prove some basic properties of the sets $L_j(B)$. In particular, Lemma 6.1 i) provides an equivalent formulation of $L_j(P_{j'})$ in terms of an r-eigenform E. Such a formulation will be used in the following without mention.

Lemma 6.1 *Let E be an r-eigenform. Then*

i) Given $P_h \in V^{(0)}$, then $P_h \in L_j(P_{j'})$ if and only if $T_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) > 0$.

ii) Given $\{j,j'\}\in J$, we have $L_j(P_{j'})\neq\emptyset$ if and only if $\{P_j,P_{j'}\}\in\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

iii) If j,j_1,j_2 are mutually different elements of $\mathcal{U}$ and $L_j(P_{j_1})\cap L_j(P_{j_2})\neq\emptyset$ then $\{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\}\in\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, in particular P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} are in the same j-component.

iv) For every $\{j,j'\}\in J$, $L_j(P_{j'})$ is either empty or a j-component.

v) There exists a bijiection $\beta=\beta_j$ from $\{1,...,m_j\}$ into itself such that $L_j(C_{j,s})=C_{j,\beta(s)}$.

Proof. i) We have $T_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h)=H_{1;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})\big(\psi_j(P_h)\big)$, thus, by Lemma 4.4 ii), $T_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P'_j})(P_h)>0$ if and only if $h\neq j$ and $P_{j'}$ is connected to $\psi_j(P_h)$ in $(V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)},\mathcal{G}_1(E))$. Now recall that $\mathcal{G}_1(E)=S\big(\mathcal{G}_0(E)\big)$ and $\mathcal{G}_0(E)=\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

ii) Recall that $\Lambda(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})=\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, hence, by the definition of $\Lambda(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})$, $\{P_j,P_{j'}\}\in\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if P_j and $P_{j'}$ are connected in $\big(V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)},S(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})\big)$. This in turns, clearly amounts to the existence of P_h with $h\neq j$ such that $P_{j'}$ is connected to $\psi_j(P_h)$ in $\big(V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)},S(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})\big)$, and ii) follows at once.

iii) Take $P_h\in L_j(P_{j_1})\cap L_j(P_{j_2})$. Then $h\neq j$, so that $\psi_j(P_h)\in V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)}$. Moreover both P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} are connected to $\psi_j(P_h)$, hence P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} are connected, in $\big(V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)},S(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})\big)$. It follows that $\{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\}\in\Lambda(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})=\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

iv) and v) If P_h and $P_{h'}$ lies in the same j-component, then $\psi_j(P_h)$ and $\psi_j(P_{h'})$ are connected in $\big(V^{(1)}\setminus V^{(0)},S(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})\big)$. Hence $P_h\in L_j(P_{j'})$ if and only if $P_{h'}\in L_j(P_{j'})$. Thus, $L_j(P_{j'})$ is the union of j-components, hence, for every $s=1,...,m_j$, so is $L_j(C_{j,s})$. On the other hand as $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is connected, by the definition of j-component, there exists $P_{j'}\in C_{j,s}$ such that $\{P_j,P_{j'}\}\in\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, hence, by ii), $L_j(C_{j,s})\neq\emptyset$. Therefore, there exists a nonempty subset $\Gamma_{j,s}$ of $\{1,...,m_j\}$ such that

$$L_j(C_{j,s})=\bigcup_{s'\in\Gamma_{j,s}}C_{j,s'}.$$

On the other hand, the nonempty sets $\Gamma_{j,s}$, $s=1,...,m_j$, are mutually disjoint by iii), hence they are all singletons, and v) is proved. Finally, given $P_{j'}\in V^{(0)}\setminus\{P_j\}$, let $C_{j,s}$ be the j-component containing it. Then $L_j(P_{j'})$ is the union of j-components, and is contained in $L_j(C_{j,s})=C_{j,\beta(s)}$, thus either is empty or amounts to $C_{j,\beta(s)}$, and iv) is proved. ∎

When $u\in\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ we have $u=\sum_{P_{j'}\in V^{(0)}}u(P_{j'})\chi_{P_{j'}}$, hence for every $j\in\mathcal{V}$, $r\in W$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$T^n_{j;E;r}(u)=\sum_{P_{j'}\in V^{(0)}}u(P_{j'})T^n_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}}) \tag{6.1}$$

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose E is an r-eigenform.*

i) If $u\in\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_j$, $u\geq 0$, $B=\{P_h:u(P_h)>0\}$ and n is a positive integer n, then

$$L^n_j(B)=\{P_h:T^n_{j;E;r}(u)(P_h)>0\}=\mathcal{F}_n\text{-}L_{j^{(n)}}(B).$$

ii) for every $n \geq 1$, given $\{j, j'\} \in J$ we have $\{P_j, P_{j'}\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if $L_j^n(P_{j'}) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there exists $P_h \in V^{(0)}$ such that $T^n_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) > 0$.

Proof. i) By (6.1) $T_{j;E;r}(u)(P_h) > 0$ if and only if there exists $P_l \in B$ such that $T_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_l})(P_h) > 0$ if and only if $P_h \in L_j(B)$ by Lemma 6.1 i), and this proves the first equality if $n = 1$. As $T^n_{j;E;r}(u) = \mathcal{F}_n$-$T_{j^{(n)};E;r^n}(u)$ by Lemma 4.1 ii), the second equality follows from the first one with $n = 1$ in $\mathcal{F}_n$. The first equality for general n follows by recursion. Suppose the Lemma valid for some n. Then $T^{n+1}_{j;E;r}(u)(P_h) > 0$ iff $T_{j;E;r}\big(T^n_{j;E;r}(u)\big)(P_h) > 0$ iff $P_h \in L_j(B_n)$ where $B_n = \{P_h : T^n_{j;E;r}(u)(P_h) > 0\}$ using the case $n = 1$. Thus, by the case n, $T^{n+1}_{j;E;r}(u)(P_h) > 0$ iff $h \in L_j\big(L_j^n(B)\big) = L_j^{n+1}(B)$.

ii) In view of Lemma 6.1 ii) in $\mathcal{F}_n$ with $j^{(n)}$ in place of j, this follows from i), putting $u = \chi_{P_j'}$ so that $B = \{P_{j'}\}$. ∎

Let $\mathbb{R}_A^{V^{(0)}} := \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : u(P) = 0 \ \ \forall\, P \notin A\big\}$ when $A \subseteq V^{(0)}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{R}_A^{V^{(0)}}$ can be identified to $\mathbb{R}^A$, and we will use such an identification. In particular, we will say that $u \in \mathbb{R}_A^{V^{(0)}}$ is *A-positive* if $u(P_h) > 0$ for every $P_h \in A$. For every $s = 1, ..., m_j$, by Lemma 6.1 v) there exists a positive integer n such that $L_j^n(C_{j,s}) = C_{j,s}$. Let $n_{j,s}$ be the minimum positive integer having such a property.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose E is an r-eigenform.*

i) We have $C_{j,s} = C'_{j,s} \cup C''_{j,s}$ where

$$C'_{j,s} = \Big\{P_{j'} \in C_{j,s} \colon T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) > 0 \ \ \forall\, P_h \in C_{j,s}, T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) = 0 \ \ \forall\, P_h \notin C_{j,s}\Big\},$$

$$C''_{j,s} = \big\{P_{j'} \in C_{j,s} \colon T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) = 0 \ \ \forall\, P_h \in V^{(0)}\big\}.$$

Moreover, $C'_{j,s} \neq \emptyset$.

ii) If $\{j, j'\} \in J$, then $\{P_j, P_{j'}\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if $P_{j'} \in C'_{j,s}$.

iii) If $P_{j_1}, P_{j_2} \in C'_{j,s}$ and $j_1 \neq j_2$, then $\{P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$.

iv) $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}$ maps $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$ into itself.

v) If $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, $u \geq 0$ and $u(P) > 0$ for at least one $P \in C'_{j,s}$, then $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)(P) > 0$ for every $P \in C_{j,s}$.

Proof. i) We have

$$C_{j,s} = L_j^{n_{j,s}}(C_{j,s}) = \bigcup_{P_{j'} \in C_{j,s}} L_j^{n_{j,s}}(P_{j'}) \tag{6.2}$$

and, on the other hand, by Lemma 6.1 iv), when $P_{j'} \in C_{j,s}$, then $L_j^{n_{j,s}}(P_{j'})$ amounts either to $\emptyset$ or to $C_{j,s}$. Using Lemma 6.2 i), with $u := \chi_{P_{j'}}$, we see that in the former case $P_{j'} \in C''_{j,s}$, and in the latter, $P_{j'} \in C'_{j,s}$. By (6.2), the latter case occurs for at least one $P_{j'} \in C_{j,s}$. ii) This follows from i) and Lemma 6.2 ii). iii) Given j_1, j_2 as in the statement iii), by Lemma 6.2 ii)

$$\mathcal{F}_{n_{j,s}}\text{-}L_{j^{(n_{j,s})}}(P_{j_1}) \cap \mathcal{F}_{n_{j,s}}\text{-}L_{j^{(n_{j,s})}}(P_{j_2}) = L_j^{n_{j,s}}(P_{j_1}) \cap L_j^{n_{j,s}}(P_{j_2}) = C_{j,s},$$

thus, iii) follows from Lemma 6.1 iii) in $\mathcal{F}_{n_{j,s}}$. iv) immediately follows from i), and v) follows from (6.1) and the definition of $C'_{j,s}$. ∎

If $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, $s = 1, ..., m_j$, let $g_{j,s}(u) = \big(u - u(P_j)\big)\chi_{C_{j,s}} \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$ Let $\tilde{g}_{j,s} : \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} \to \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C'_{j,s}}$ be defined by $\tilde{g}_{j,s}(u) = u\chi_{C'_{j,s}}$.

Lemma 6.4 *Suppose E is an r-eigenform.*

i) $\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}$ is a positive linear operator from $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C'_{j,s}}$ into itself, thus it has a unique $C'_{j,s}$-positive eigenvector $\overline{u}_{j,s}$ of norm 1 with eigenvalue $l_{j,s} > 0$.

ii) Putting $\tilde{u}_{j,s} := T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\overline{u}_{j,s})$, $\tilde{u}_{j,s}$ is a $C_{j,s}$-positive eigenvector of $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}$ with eigenvalue $l_{j,s}$.

iii) for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$ there exists $\pi_{j,s}(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\frac{T^{hn_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)}{l^{h-1}_{j,s}} \underset{h\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \pi_{j,s}(u)\tilde{u}_{j,s}$.

Proof. i) Let $P_{j'} \in C'_{j,s}$. By definition, we have

$$\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) = T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h) > 0 \quad \forall\, P_h \in C'_{j,s}$$

and i) is proved. ii) First, By Lemma 6.3 iv) and v), $\tilde{u}_{j,s}$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$ and is $C_{j,s}$-positive. Next, note that

$$T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r} \circ \tilde{g}_{j,s} = T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r} \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}. \tag{6.3}$$

In fact, if $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$, then $u - \tilde{g}_{j,s}(u) = 0$ on $V^{(0)} \setminus C''_{j,s}$. Thus, we have for some $a_{j'} \in \mathbb{R}$, $u - \tilde{g}_{j,s}(u) = \sum\limits_{P_{j'} \in C''_{j,s}} a_{j'}\chi_{P_{j'}}$ and thus, by definition of $C''_{j,s}$,

$$T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big(u - \tilde{g}_{j,s}(u)\big) = \sum_{P_{j'} \in C''_{j,s}} a_{j'} T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}}) = 0.$$

and (6.3) is proved. We have

$$T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s}) = T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big(T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\overline{u}_{j,s})\big) =$$

$$T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big(\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\overline{u}_{j,s})\big) = T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(l_{j,s}\overline{u}_{j,s}) = l_{j,s}\tilde{u}_{j,s}$$

and ii) is proved. iii) By the Perron-Frobenius Theory, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C'_{j,s}}$ there exists $\pi_{j,s}(u)$ such that

$$\frac{\big(\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big)^h(u)}{l^h_{j,s}} \underset{h\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \pi_{j,s}(u)\overline{u}_{j,s} \tag{6.4}$$

More generally, (6.4) holds if $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$. In fact, $\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u) \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C'_{j,s}}$, thus it suffices to put $\pi_{j,s}(u) = \frac{1}{l_{j,s}} \pi_{j,s}\big(\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)\big)$. Let now $u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$. By Lemma 6.3 iv) and (6.3) we have $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\Big(\big(\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big)^h(u)\Big) = T^{(h+1)n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)$. Thus,

$$\frac{T^{(h+1)n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)}{l^h_{j,s}} = T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\left(\frac{\big(\tilde{g}_{j,s} \circ T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big)^h(u)}{l^h_{j,s}}\right) \underset{h\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \pi_{j,s}(u) T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\overline{u}_{j,s}) = \pi_{j,s}(u)\tilde{u}_{j,s},$$

and iii) is proved. ∎

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose E is an r-eigenform.*

i) We have $l_{j,s} = (\rho r_j^{-1})^{n_{j,s}} \in]0,1[$.

ii) If X is a $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}$-invariant linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$ and $u \in X$ and P_j is an E-nonharmonic point for u, then $\tilde{u}_{j,s} \in X$.

Proof. By Lemma 6.4 ii), $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s}) = l_{j,s}\tilde{u}_{j,s}$, thus, by Lemma 2.6 i) we have

$$L_E(\tilde{u}_{j,s})(P_j) = \big(\frac{r_j}{\rho}\big)^{n_{j,s}} L_E\Big(T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s})\Big)(P_j) =$$

$$\big(\frac{r_j}{\rho}\big)^{n_{j,s}} L_E(l_{j,s}\tilde{u}_{j,s})(P_j) = \big(\frac{r_j}{\rho}\big)^{n_{j,s}} l_{j,s} L_E(\tilde{u}_{j,s})(P_j).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.4 ii) $\tilde{u}_{j,s}$ is positive on the nonempty set $C_{j,s}$ and amounts to 0 otherwise, thus, by Lemma 6.3 ii), we have $L_E(\tilde{u}_{j,s})(P_j) > 0$, and i) follows at once.

I now prove ii). If $u \in X$, then by definition, also $\dfrac{T^{hn_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)}{l^{h-1}_{j,s}} \in X$ for every positive integer h, and as X, being a finite dimensional linear space, is closed, then by Lemma 6.4 iii) $\pi_{j,s}(u)\tilde{u}_{j,s} \in X$, and in order to conclude it suffices to prove $\pi_{j,s}(u) \neq 0$.
Now, by Lemma 6.4 iii) again, i) and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\pi_{j,s}(u) L_E(\tilde{u}_{j,s})(P_j) = L_E\big(\pi_{j,s}(u)\tilde{u}_{j,s}\big)(P_j) = \lim_{h\to+\infty} L_E\Big(l^{-(h-1)}_{j,s} T^{hn_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)\Big)(P_j)$$

$$= \lim_{h\to+\infty} l^{-(h-1)}_{j,s} L_E\Big(T^{hn_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(u)\Big)(P_j) = \big(\frac{\rho}{r_j}\big)^{n_{j,s}} L_E(u)(P_j) \neq 0$$

by the hypothesis that P_j is an E-nonharmonic point for u, thus $\pi_{j,s}(u) \neq 0$ and ii) is proved. ∎

7. Stable subsets of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$.

Lemma 7.1 *If $E_1, E_2 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_0(E_1) = \mathcal{G}_0(E_2) = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, and $u \in A^{\pm}(E_1, E_2)$, then $g_{j,s}(u) \in A^{\pm}(E_1, E_2)$ for every $s = 1, ..., m_j$.*

Proof. We have $E_i(u) = \sum_{s=1}^{m_j} E_i\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big)$ for $i = 1, 2$. In fact, by the definition of j-component, we have $c_{j_1,j_2}(E_i) = 0$ when P_{j_1} and P_{j_2} lie in different j-components. It follows

$$E_i(u)=\sum_{s=1}^{m_j}\Big(\sum_{P_{j_1},P_{j_2}\in C_{j,s}}c_{j_1,j_2}(E_i)\big(u(P_{j_1})-u(P_{j_2})\big)^2+\sum_{P_{j_1}\in C_{j,s}}c_{j_1,j}(E_i)\big(u(P_{j_1})-u(P_j)\big)^2\Big)$$

$$=\sum_{s=1}^{m_j}E_i\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big),$$

and the lemma easily follows. ∎

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ be the set of (j,s) such that $j\in\mathcal{U}$ and $s=1,...,m_j$. In general, for an arbitrary r-eigenform E, I say that a subset B of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ is (E,r)-stable if, for every $(j,s)\in B$ every $(j',s')\in\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}\setminus B$, every $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and every $i_1,...,i_n\in\mathcal{V}$, $P_{j'}$ is E-harmonic for $g_{j',s'}\big(T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s})\big)$.

Lemma 7.2 *Suppose $u\in\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$, and for every $(j,s)\in\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$, P_j is E-harmonic point for $g_{j,s}(u)$, with $E\in\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Then u is constant on $V^{(0)}$.*

Proof. For every $(j,s)\in\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$, we have

$$0=L_E\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big)(P_j)=L_E\Big(\chi_{C_{j,s}}\big(u-u(P_j)\big)\Big)(P_j)$$

so that, for every $j\in\mathcal{U}$

$$L_E(u)(P_j)=L_E\big(u-u(P_j)\big)(P_j)=L_E\Big(\sum_{s=1}^{m_j}\chi_{C_{j,s}}\big(u-u(P_j)\big)\Big)(P_j)$$

$$=\sum_{s=1}^{m_j}L_E\Big(\chi_{C_{j,s}}\big(u-u(P_j)\big)\Big)(P_j)=0$$

hence u is E-harmonic at every point P_j, thus, by Lemma 2.1, u is constant on $V^{(0)}$. ∎

Lemma 7.3 *Suppose E is an r-eigenform. Then, for every $(j,s)\in\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$, the function $E_{j,s}$ defined by*

$$E_{j,s}(u)=\Big(L_E\Big(T_{j;E;r}^{m_{j,s}}\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big)\Big)(P_j)\Big)^2$$

has the form

$$E_{j,s}(u)=\sum_{\{P_{j_i},P_{j_2}\}\in\widehat{\mathcal{G}}}d_{\{j_1,j_2\}}\big(u(P_{j_1})-u(P_{j_2})\big)^2$$

for suitable (possibly negative) $d_{\{j_1,j_2\}}\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We have $g_{j,s}(u)=\sum_{P_{j'}\in C_{j,s}}\big(u(P_{j'})-u(P_j)\big)\chi_{P_{j'}}$, hence,

$$T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big) = \sum_{P_{j'}\in C_{j,s}} \big(u(P_{j'}) - u(P_j)\big) T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}}),$$

and, as $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_j) = \chi_{P_{j'}}(P_j) = 0$, using Lemma 6.3 i), we have

$$L_E\Big(T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}\big(g_{j,s}(u)\big)\Big)(P_j) = \sum_{h\in\mathcal{U}\setminus\{j\}} \sum_{P_{j'}\in C_{j,s}} c_{j,h}(E)\big(u(P_{j'}) - u(P_j)\big) T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h)$$

$$= \sum_{P_h\in C_{j,s}} \sum_{P_{j'}\in C'_{j,s}} c_{j,h}(E)\big(u(P_{j'}) - u(P_j)\big) T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}(\chi_{P_{j'}})(P_h)$$

Thus,

$$E_{j,s}(u) = \sum_{j'\in C'_{j,s}} \alpha_{j'}\big(u(P_{j'}) - u(P_j)\big)^2 + \sum_{j_1,j_2\in C'_{j,s}} \beta_{j_1,j_2}\big(u(P_{j_1}) - u(P_j)\big)\big(u(P_{j_2}) - u(P_j)\big)$$

for suitable $\alpha_{j'}, \beta_{j_1,j_2} \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, using the identity $ab = \frac{1}{2}\big(a^2 + b^2 - (a-b)^2\big)$, in view of Lemma 6.3, ii) and iii), we conclude. ∎

Theorem 7.4 *If E is an r-eigenform, then we have r-uniqueness if and only if every two nonempty (E,r)-stable subsets of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ are not disjoint.*

Proof. Suppose first every two nonempty (E,r)-stable subsets of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ are not disjoint, and prove the uniqueness. Let E' be an r-eigenform. Putting

$$B^{\pm} := \big\{(j,s) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} : \tilde{u}_{j,s} \in A^{\pm}(E,E')\big\},$$

we prove that $B^{\pm}$ are nonempty (E,r)-stable subsets of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$. They are nonempty. In fact, let $u \in \widetilde{A}^{\pm}(E,E')$, and let P_j be a minimum point of u. We can and do assume $u(P_j) = 0$ and $u(P_{j'}) > 0$ with $\{P_j, P_{j'}\} \in \mathcal{G}_0(E)$. In fact, given $\tilde{j}$ such that $u(P_{\tilde{j}}) > 0$ we can replace u by $u - u(P_j)$, and consider a path connecting P_j with $P_{\tilde{j}}$ in $\mathcal{G}_0(E)$ and consider two consecutive elements j'', j' in the path such that $u(P_{j''}) = 0$, $u(P_{j'}) > 0$, and finally replace j'' by j. Let $s = 1, ..., m_j$ be so that $P_{j'} \in C_{j,s}$. Then P_j is not E-harmonic for $g_{j,s}(u)$, and, in view of Lemma 7.1, $g_{j,s}(u)$ belongs to $A^{\pm}(E,E') \cap \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$, which is a $T^{n_{j,s}}_{j;E;r}$-invariant linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j,s}}$. Hence, by Lemma 6.5 ii), $\tilde{u}_{j,s} \in \widetilde{A}^{\pm}(E,E')$, and $(j,s) \in B^{\pm}$.

We now prove that $B^{\pm}$ are (E,r)-stable subsets of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$. Suppose $(j,s) \in B^{\pm}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$, and $P_{j'}$ is (E,r)-nonharmonic point for

$$\overline{u} := g_{j',s'}\big(T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s})\big),$$

and prove that $(j',s') \in B^{\pm}$. By Prop. 2.2 i) and Lemma 7.1, $\overline{u} \in A^{\pm}$, and also $\overline{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j',s'}}$. Moreover $A^{\pm}(E,E') \cap \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j',s'}}$, is a $T^{n_{j',s'}}_{j';E;r}$-invariant linear subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}_{C_{j',s'}}$. By Lemma 6.5 ii) again $\tilde{u}_{j',s'} \in \widetilde{A}^{\pm}(E,E')$, and $(j',s') \in B^{\pm}$.

In conclusion, by the hypothesis, there exists $(j,s) \in B^+ \cap B^-$, thus $\tilde{u}_{j,s} \in \widetilde{A}^+(E,E') \cap \widetilde{A}^-(E,E')$, and E' is a multipole of E, thus we have r-uniqueness.

Suppose conversely that there exist two nonempty (E,r)-stable subsets B_1 and B_2 of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ that are not disjoint, and prove that we have r-nonuniqueness. Let

$$X_i := \Big\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}} : L_E\Big(g_{j,s}\big(T_{i_1,\dots,i_n;E;r}(u)\big)\Big)(P_j) = 0 \ \forall\, i_1,\dots,i_n \in \mathcal{V},\ \forall\,(j,s) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \setminus B_i \Big\}.$$

Then X_1 and X_2 are two $T_{E;r}$-invariant c-linear subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$. The only nontrivial point to prove is that they strictly contain the constants, but by definition of a (E,r)-stable subset, we have that $\tilde{u}_{j,s} \in X_i$ when $(j,s) \in B_i$. Moreover X_1 and X_2 are almost disjoint. In fact, if $u \in X_1 \cap X_2$, then, as B_1 and B_2 are supposed to be disjoint, then in particular, P_j is E-harmonic for $g_{j,s}(u)$ for every $(j,s) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$, thus, by Lemma 7.2, u is constant on $V^{(0)}$.

By Lemma 2.4, the set K_{t,E,X_2,X_1} is closed and Λ_r invariant for every $t > 1$. In view of Lemma 2.3, to prove the r-nonuniqueness, it suffices to prove that for some $t > 1$ it is also nonempty. Let

$$E' = t\big(E - \delta E''\big), \quad E'' := \sum_{(j,s)\in B_2} E_{j,s}.$$

We will prove that for suitable $\delta > 0$ and $t > 1$ $E' \in K_{t,E,X_1,X_2}$. Note that for δ small enough, in view of Lemma 7.3, $E' \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Next, by the definition of $E_{j,s}$ and Lemma 2.6 i), we have

$$E''(u) = 0 \iff P_j \ \text{ is } E\text{-harmonic point for } g_{j,s}(u) \quad \forall\,(j,s) \in B_2. \tag{7.1}$$

In particular, as B_1 and B_2 are disjoint, $E'' = 0$ on X_1, hence $E' = tE$ on X_1 is in any case satisfied, and the condition $E' \le tE$ on $\mathbb{R}^{V^{(0)}}$ is obviously satisfied. It remains to prove

$$E' \le E \quad \text{on } X_2 \tag{7.2}$$

Suppose $u \in X_2$, u nonconstant. Then, by Lemma 7.2 and (7.1), $E''(u) > 0$, hence $(E - \delta E'')(u) < E(u)$. As the ratio $\alpha := \frac{E}{E-\delta E''}$ has a minimum $t > 1$ on the compact set $S_{X_2} =: \{u \in X_2 : u(P_1) = 0, ||u|| = 1\}$, and is 0-homogeneous and invariant with respect to an additive constant, then it has a minimum $t > 1$ on the set of nonconstant functions of X_2. Clearly, with such a value of t, (7.2) is satisfied. ∎

Remark 7.5 By using the same argument as in Section 3, we need only finitely many calculations to verify whether a subset of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ is (E,r)-stable. In fact, we can see that a subset B of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ is (E,r)-stable if and only if, for every $(j,s) \in B$, every $(j',s') \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \setminus B$, every $n =$

$0, 1, ..., N-1$ and every $i_1, ..., i_n \in \mathcal{V}$, then $P_{j'}$ is E-harmonic for $g_{j',s'}\big(T_{i_1,...,i_n;E;r}(\tilde{u}_{j,s})\big)$. ■

References

[1] Barlow M.T., Bass R.F., Kumagai T., and Teplyaev A., Uniqueness of Brownian Motion on Sierpinski Carpets. J. Eur. Math. Soc. 12 (2010), 655-701.

[2] Hambly, B.M., Metz, V., Teplyaev, A.: Self-Similar Energies on p.c.f. Self-Similar Fractals. J. London Math. Soc. 74, 93-112 (2006).

[3] Hattori, K., Hattori, T., Watanabe, H.: Gaussian Field Theories on General Networks and the Spectral Dimension. Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 92, 108-143 (1987).

[4] Kigami, J.: Harmonic Calculus on p.c.f. Self-similar Sets. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 335, 721-755 (1993).

[5] Kigami, J.: Analysis on fractals, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 143. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[6] Lindstrøm, T., Brownian Motion on Nested Fractals. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. No. 420 (1990).

[7] Metz, V.: How many Diffusions Exist on the Vicsek Snowflake?. Acta Appl. Math. 32, 227-241 (1993).

[8] Metz, V.: Renormalization Contracts on Nested Fractals. J. Reine Angew. Math. 480, 161-175 (1996).

[9] Metz, V.: The cone of diffusions on finitely ramified fractals. Nonlinear Anal. 55 no. 6, 723–738 (2003).

[10] Metz, V.: The short-cut test. Journal of Functional Analysis 220, 118-156 (2005).

[11] Peirone, R.: Convergence and Uniqueness Problems for Dirichlet Forms on Fractals. Boll. U.M.I., 8, 3-B, 431-460 (2000).

[12] R. Peirone, Existence of Eigenforms on Nicely Separated Fractals, in Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 77, 231-241, 2008.

[13] Peirone.: R.: Existence of Self-similar Energies on Finitely Ramified Fractals, to appear on Journal d'Analyse Mathematique.

[14] Peirone, R.: Uniqueness of Eigenforms on Fractals, Math. Nachr. 1-19 (2013), DOI 10.1002/mana.201200247

[15] Sabot, C.: Existence and Uniqueness of Diffusions on Finitely Ramified Self-Similar Fractals. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 30 no. 5, 605-673 (1997).

[16] Strichartz.: R. S. Differential equations on fractals: A tutorial, Princeton University Press, 2006.